

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	ю.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,488		09/08/2003	Wei-Bin Chen	AP4403 (15739/170CIP)	2681
23595	7590	08/08/2005		EXAMINER	
		ERSEREAU, P.A.	CHEN, JOSE V		
900 SEC SUITE 82		ENUE SOUTH		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
MINNEA	POLIS,	S, MN 55402		3637	
		•		DATE MAILED: 08/08/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N	lo. Applicant(s)	
<u> </u>	10/657,488	CHEN, WEI-BIN	
Office Action Summar	Examiner	Art Unit	
	José V. Chen	3637	
The MAILING DATE of this com Period for Reply	munication appears on the co	ver sheet with the correspondence a	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMM - Extensions of time may be available under the provafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this - If the period for reply specified above is less than the fixed period for reply is specified above, the maxim - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for Any reply received by the Office later than three may be a fixed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704	MUNICATION. isions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, h communication. iirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory ium statutory period will apply and will exp r reply will, by statute, cause the application	nowever, may a reply be timely filed minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered time ire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this on to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ely. communication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication (s	s) filed on <u>08 September 2003</u>	<u>3</u> .	
2a)☐ This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action is non-	final.	
3) Since this application is in cond	ition for allowance except for	formal matters, prosecution as to th	e merits is
closed in accordance with the p	ractice under <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e	ə, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in	the application		
4a) Of the above claim(s)	• •	deration .	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	istare withdrawn from consid	ioration.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.		·	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected	to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to re		irement.	
Application Papers	; ;	·	
9) The specification is objected to t	·		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is			
•		eld in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).)
11) The oath or declaration is object	-	fthe drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 C the attached Office Action or form P	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a c	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	•
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None 1. ☐ Certified copies of the pri	oi. onty documents have been re	eceived	
	•	eceived in Application No.	
 · · · ·	•	have been received in this Nationa	l Stage
	national Bureau (PCT Rule 17		
* See the attached detailed Office	•		
	; •		
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	Interview Summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Revi Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-14 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/08/03</u>. 		≓ '' `	O-152)
S. Detect and Trademark Office			

Application/Control Number: 10/657,488

Art Unit: 3637

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5-12, 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim(s) 5 fail(s) to recite sufficient structural elements and interconnection of the elements to positively position and define: 1) how the support members and the lower plate form the front wheel-positioning groove; 2) how the through hole, support members and lower plate form the rear wheel-receiving compartments; 3) the two cutouts (with respect to what structure?) so that an integral structure able to function as claimed is recited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Creek et al. The patent to Creek et al teaches structure as claimed including a pallet comprising an upper side and an underside, the upper side of the pallet having a front end and a rear end, two rear wheel-receiving compartments (at where the reference numerals 70 and 72) being defined in the rear end of the upper side of the pallet and adapted to

Art Unit: 3637

receive two rear wheels of a three-wheeled motorcycle, a front wheel-positioning groove (80) being defined in the front end of the upper side of the pallet and adapted to position a front wheel of the three-wheeled motorcycle, one through-hole (36) adapted to be extended through by at least one fork of a forklift for moving the pallet, the front wheel-positioning groove is defined in a central portion of the front end of the upper side of the pallet, the rear wheel-receiving compartments are respectively defined in two rear corners of the upper side of the pallet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 4, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Creek et al as applied to the claims above, and further in view of White. The patent to

Creek et al teaches structure substantially as claimed as discussed above, the only

difference being that the structure is not made of paper and does not include additional

Art Unit: 3637

through holes. However, the patent to White teaches the use of providing a paper pallet and additional through holes to be old. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the structure of Creek et al to include additional through holes and made of a different material, as taught by White since such structures are conventional alternative structures used in the same intended purpose, thereby providing structure as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-12, 14-20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Fish, Hanazato, Smith, Junge, Marron et al, Dunn, teach structure similar to applicant's.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José V. Chen whose telephone number is (571)272-6865. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f,m-th 5:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571)272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3637

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jose V. Chen Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3637

Chen/jvc 08-03-05